

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8-20 and 22 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. Claims 7 and 21 were previously cancelled and remain cancelled.

In the Final Office Action of June 30, 2009, claims 1-6, 8-20 and 22 were rejected.

With this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 15, 18 and 20 are amended.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-6, 12-14, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Moor et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,171,663) (“*Moor*”) in view of *Nitz et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,370,590) (“*Nitz*”) in further view of *Hickman* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,173,332) (“*Hickman*”).

Claims 8-11 and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Moor et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,171,663) (“*Moor*”) in view of *Nitz et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,370,590) (“*Nitz*”) in further view of *Hickman* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,173,332) (“*Hickman*”) in further view of *Gershman et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,199,099) (“*Gershman*”).

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 12, 15, 18 and 20 now recite concurrently determining which of said first and second tasks should receive each of said platform-specific events.

*Moor*, *Nitz*, *Hickman* and *Gershman* fail to disclose or even fairly suggest concurrently determining which of said first and second tasks should receive each of said platform-specific events. Instead, *Moor* discloses receiving one request and then checking for additional requests without disclosing concurrently determining which task should receive each request or simultaneously manipulating more than one request. See, U.S. Pat. No. 7,171,663, Col. 6, l. 24-67. *Nitz* merely discloses receiving and processing one request at a time. See, U.S. Pat. No. 6,370,590, Col. 8, l. 39-57. *Hickman* and *Gershman* fail to disclose anything pertaining to

concurrently determining which tasks should receive a requests or simultaneously modifying multiple requests.

Therefore, because *Moore*, *Nitz*, *Hickman* and *Gershman* fail to disclose or even fairly suggest every limitation of claims 1, 12, 15, 18 and 20, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 2-6, 8-11, 12-17 and 22 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 12, 15, 18 and 20, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 30, 2009\_\_

By: /Timothy M Nitsch/\_\_\_\_\_

Timothy M. Nitsch  
Registration No. 58,019  
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000